

Message

From: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: 11/2/2018 7:21:26 PM
To: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]; Amy Brownell (amy.brownell@sfdph.org) [amy.brownell@sfdph.org]
CC: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: EPA responses to media inquiries this week

From: Calvino, Maria Soledad
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 12:15 PM
To: Franklin, William D CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO <william.d.franklin@navy.mil>; Kagan, Rachael (DPH <rachael.kagan@sfdph.org>; Dale.Schornack@cdph.ca.gov; jeff.cretan@sfgov.org; McKinney, Kasheica (CII <kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org>; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov
Cc: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Subject: EPA responses to media inquiries this week

Good morning PIO Team,
FYSA – Below are the responses that EPA sent to Chris Roberts (Curbed SF) and Nicholas Iovino (Courthouse News) earlier this week. We also got several requests for comment regarding the Committee to Bridge the Gap report. We sent the following statement to the SF Chronicle, NBC Bay Area and SF Examiner: “EPA has not reviewed the report published by the Committee to Bridge the Gap and will not be able to comment on it at this time.”
We are also working on a SF Chronicle response for later today. I will send that once it’s finalized.

November 1, 2018
Curbed SF, Chris Roberts
Question:

Just one quick question for EPA today regarding a follow-up story we're doing about the whistleblower complaints unsealed in federal court last week. As you know, the Justice Department is joining in on these suits. The complaints contain allegations that Tetra Tech's work at Alameda NAS and Treasure Island may also be questionable. Is this something that EPA has looked into? Does EPA believe that Tetra Tech Inc's work, and the work of its subsidiaries, at Treasure Island and/or Alameda NAS can be trusted? If so, why? And if not, what actions is EPA taking to address it?

Response:

EPA has not received or reviewed any information about allegations that Tetra Tech EC Inc work at Alameda Naval Air Station (NAS) may be questionable. As with Hunters Point, the Navy is the lead agency responsible for cleanup of the Alameda NAS Superfund site. EPA and its state regulatory partners (including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the California Department of Public Health, and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board), oversee and enforce Navy compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (commonly called the Superfund law) and other requirements to ensure the cleanup process at Alameda NAS protects human health and the environment.

The Navy reports that they have looked closely at radiological data at Alameda NAS and have found no irregularities. The Navy also indicates that many different contractors were used and produced consistent data. In terms of background, historic site uses at Alameda NAS were quite different than Hunters Point. Alameda NAS did not have a Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory or conduct decontamination of ships from weapons testing.

Treasure Island is not on the National Priorities List (NPL); therefore, it is overseen by the State, not EPA. Please contact the Navy or the CA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

Media contacts:

DTSC: Abbott Dutton, Media Relations Manager, Abbott.Dutton@dtsc.ca.gov

Navy: Bill Franklin, William.d.franklin@navy.mil, 619-524-5433

October 30, 2018

Courthouse News, Nicholas Iovino

Question:

Can you please provide me with EPA documents that outline the proper standards and procedures for clearing a site suspected of radioactive contamination, such as the clean-up projects for Treasure Island and Hunters Point in San Francisco?

Response:

Standards and procedures are specific to sites or portions of sites. For example, Hunters Point is divided into different parcels that each have Records of Decisions (RODs). The Navy is the lead on the cleanup and is responsible for maintaining the full Administrative Record.

Here is the public contact for the Navy:

Derek J. Robinson, PE

BRAC Environmental Coordinator

Navy BRAC PMO West

Desk Phone: 619-524-6026

derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil

The Navy's press contact is: Bill Franklin, William.d.franklin@navy.mil, 619-524-5433.

Here is the Navy's website where you can look up the RODs and other documents:

https://www.navfac.navy.mil/products_and_services/ev/products_and_services/env_restoration/administrative_records.html?fromDate=DD-MON-YYYY&toDate=DD-MON-YYYY&p_instln_id=HUNTERS_POINT_NS&basic=&title=&sites=&author=&keywords=

In addition, the State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor website has the RODs and other documents. Here is the link:

https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?CMD=search&city=San+Francisco&zip=&county=&case_number=&business_name=&FEDERAL_SUPERFUND=True

November 1, 2018

Courthouse News, Nicholas Iovino

Follow up to previous response:

Are there no documents that identify what types of testing should be done for specific environmental conditions?

How does the government determine what kind of testing should be done to verify a site is cleaned up if there are no guidelines for determining which tests and procedures should be used?

Response:

Yes, for example, the Records of Decisions (RODs) mentioned in the previous email identify what types of testing should be done for specific environmental conditions. For example, the [Parcel G ROD](#) discusses these in Table 6, and Section 2.9 on pages -pp. 41-47.

EPA does have guidelines, and they are tailored to site-specific conditions. See this website for examples of guidelines that are sometimes used, depending on the circumstances at a particular site:

<https://www.epa.gov/superfund/radiation-superfund-sites>

Soledad Calvino

Press Officer | Office of Public Affairs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Region 9

calvino.maria@epa.gov

Office 415.972.3512 | Mobile 415.697.6289